

# PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN CTP & FSITP



## Public Comment Log

### Public Participation Plan (PPP) for the California Transportation Plan (CTP) and Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSITP)

---

Date: Monday, February 05, 2018 9:06 AM

Name: Leigh Bittner

Organization: Wildlife Research Institute

City: Julian, CA

Thank you for giving us an opportunity and glad to see biking and pollution as environmentally sound objectives.

However, we believe the planning strategies are lacking in wildlife protections such as exclusion fencing, directional fencing for our seriously genetically threatened puma populations. Serious consideration of wildlife crossing overpasses and underpasses is not addressed either.

I think you will find that the public would support the above if they were aware of the need.

Please refer to the research of Dr. Winston Vickers, DVM from UC Davis wildlife center. He would be an invaluable resource for you to determine where such tactics should be deployed especially in Districts 8 and 11.

#### Response:

Added “Plant and Wildlife Habitat Conservation” to Appendix D: Recommended Strategies Matrix for Community and Environmental Groups under the Topics of High Interest column. Appendix D provides outreach strategies, special considerations, and topics of high Interest particular to specific stakeholder groups.

Monday, February 05, 2018 11:18 AM

Name: Anna Jaiswal

Organization: Omnitrans

City: San Bernardino, CA

I would suggest that after collecting public comments on the CTP and FSTIP, that Caltrans put together a summary of how the input was incorporated into the document - what changes were made on account of the input - and send it back out to stakeholders. This will help stakeholders feel their input is actually being considered, which will help encourage them to provide more input in the future.

Also, I feel the Caltrans district offices need to play a much bigger role in public participation and connecting with their local communities.

And all public input needs to include interested users of all modes, including those who walk, bike, and ride transit. Perhaps if general public participation is low, it would be more effective to facilitate a citizens advisory committee made up of a few interested participants who speak on behalf of their communities and help encourage the other members of their communities to make comments on plans - such as local bicycle coalitions, Safe Routes to School advocates, etc.

I've found that it's near impossible to find any information about how to give input when Caltrans is designing projects such as interchange projects. By the time I find out what projects are being done, they're going out to bid for construction and it's too late to change the design.

I don't think Caltrans engineers quite understand how their designs impact communities, especially vulnerable users who walk and bike on arterials that cross the freeway. They need a safe crossing at places where cars are flying onto the freeway ramp and it's often extremely dangerous. I've seen two interchange projects in the past few years in San Bernardino where sidewalk was even removed on one side of the street, making walking conditions even more difficult and dangerous! How is that justifiable? If Caltrans engineers had had a public input process where they were required to listen to the input of community members, perhaps that wouldn't have happened. Especially when these overpasses will probably be there for 100 years, they need to be designed for future demand for walking and biking, not just demand for car travel.

The communication tools are so easy now - all the district offices would have to do is post on Facebook "we're seeking input on the design of this project" and then people would know about the opportunity to comment at the right time in the design process. That's the bare minimum they should be doing, considering they are doing all these projects with taxpayer funds and need to be accountable to how communities want their streets to be designed.

[Response:](#)

Paragraph 1: The PPP public comments received during the 45-day public review and comment period from January 24 through March 9, 2018, and their responses and actions taken will be posted on the PPP website at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/osp/ppp.html>.

Paragraph 2: The PPP is available for use by Caltrans HQ and District offices.

Paragraph 3: The PPP supports Caltrans mission to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability for all modes of travel.

Paragraph 4: Caltrans follows the required laws and policies that support public involvement throughout the planning and programming process. Public involvement is also an important element of the environmental planning review process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Paragraph 5: Caltrans follows uniform policies, and procedures in carrying out safe and efficient highway design functions as prescribed in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM), the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD), and the Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM). Local design issues should be directed to the appropriate Caltrans District office. Caltrans is committed to considering context sensitive solutions and complete streets concepts to improve accessibility, safety, mobility, land use, and community needs. Many of these projects require early involvement and collaboration with local transportation agencies to identify options for funding, project features, and maintenance activities.

Paragraph 6: Caltrans uses social media (facebook, Twitter, etc) to connect with stakeholders and the public about Caltrans planning and programming. These features are available on the Caltrans homepage at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/>



Date: Monday, February 05, 2018 2:42 PM

Name: Molly Begent

City: Ramona, CA

I notice that your plan lacks any strategies and/or a budget to protect wildlife with over/under passes, fencing, wildlife travel corridors? This is a serious omission and should be addressed.

**Response:**

Added "Plant and Wildlife Habitat Conservation" to Appendix D: Recommended Strategies Matrix for Community and Environmental Groups under the Topics of High Interest column. Appendix D provides outreach strategies, special considerations, and topics of high Interest particular to specific stakeholder groups.



Tuesday, February 06, 2018 10:35 AM

Name: Collin Fiske

Organization: Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities

City: McKinleyville, CA

The draft CTP & FSTIP Public Participation Plan (PPP) outlines good principles and goals for public engagement, but in our opinion it is overly vague and lacks credible implementation mechanisms. We encourage Caltrans to include more specific information about how the Plan will be implemented in practice.

Further, we are concerned that the PPP's exhortations to get involved early and stay involved beyond planning and programming ignore the realities of the transportation planning process. Our experience attempting to participate in the development of Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), for instance, is that the bulk of these Plans consists merely of lists of already-planned projects submitted by local agencies and Caltrans. The PPP identifies RTPs as part of the basis for the CTP and FSTIP, and therefore a key opportunity to get involved early. However, we have been told explicitly by a Regional Transportation Planning Agency that during RTP development it is too late to provide feedback on the various projects included in the RTP. Instead, the public is told to engage at the very beginning of the project development process (at project initiation) and during the route concept planning process neither of which provides any actual opportunity for public input. In essence, by the time the public is asked to provide input on a transportation plan whether an RTP, the CTP, or the FSTIP the projects which will later claim to be implementing the plan are already well under way, and the input has little effect.

The claim that Caltrans follows a policy of Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) is similarly mystifying to those of us who have attempted to work with the agency. The PPP defines CSS as a collaborative approach among transportation partners, stakeholders, and the public in all phases of program delivery including long-range planning, programming, environmental studies, design, construction, and maintenance that help preserve and enhance community values while improving safety and mobility. We can think of one example of this approach in our region, which is the stakeholder group convened to discuss solutions for Last Chance Grade on Highway 101 in Del Norte County but this group was convened by Representative Jared Huffman, not by Caltrans. In other instances, ranging from the design of Highway 101 through downtown Eureka to the proposed widening of Highway 101 in Richardson Grove State Park, Caltrans has been notorious for ignoring local input and performing only the bare minimum of public engagement required by law. In fact, when we convened a group of stakeholders last year in an attempt to develop a context sensitive solution to the years-long controversy over the Richardson Grove project, Caltrans refused to attend the meeting or to allow any other public comment on the project at all.

In the absence of specific mechanisms ensuring that there are real and meaningful opportunities to get involved early and stay involved beyond planning and programming, the PPP currently lacks credibility. Without credible and detailed implementation plans and accountability mechanisms, the PPP and the CTP and FSTIP will continue to reinforce the public's perception that the agency does not take public participation seriously.

**Response:**

Paragraph 1: Comment noted.

Paragraph 2: Contacting Regional transportation planning agencies within their appropriated jurisdiction can provide information on how and when public engagement opportunities are available.

Paragraph 3: Caltrans has adopted a number of policies that encourage the appropriate functional disciplines to respond to community values such as Director's Policy on Context Sensitive Solutions (DP-22), Deputy Directive on Accommodating Non-Motorized Travel (DD-64), and publications such as Main Streets: Flexibility in Design and Operations, Complete Streets, and Smart Mobility Framework.

Paragraph 4: Comment noted.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Tuesday, February 06, 2018 2:28 PM

Name: Robert Gordon

City: San Diego, CA

Road construction is necessary, however, without mitigation solutions to protect our wildlife all Californians loose.

Habitat loss is wildlife's number one threat. With these plans lacking in any strategies/budget to protect wildlife and build exclusion fencing and over and under passes for wildlife the habitat that is there is so fragmented that there IS NO usable habitat. Wildlife NEEDS a certain amount of space and protections.

We all loss if the passes and fencing are not included in the CTP and FSTIP.

One must not only think of the cost but of the VALUE of something and life.

**Response:**

Added "Plant and Wildlife Habitat Conservation" to Appendix D: Recommended Strategies Matrix for Community and Environmental Groups under the Topics of High Interest column. Appendix D provides outreach strategies, special considerations, and topics of high Interest particular to specific stakeholder groups.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Date: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 3:43 PM  
Name: R.A. "Barney" Barnett  
Organization: Highgrove Happenings Newspaper  
City Highgrove, CA

All concerned:

I have extensive information I want to send to you about the California Transportation Plan but I would like to do so with e-mail to show you the location that is needed for a Metrolink Station that has been supported by written documentation for 17 years!

Is this the correct e-mail address to send my PPP comments to, and who specifically should I direct my comments to?

**Response:**

[Sent email instructions for submitting comments on the Public Participation Plan for the CTP & FSTIP](#)

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Date: Sunday, February 11, 2018 1:17 PM  
Name: Carla McElroy  
City: San Diego, CA

I have just read the CA Transportation Plan 2040. I could not find a reference to SWAP (State Wildlife Action Plan) or any other mention of protection of wildlife in this document. I would expect that in this great state with concerns for clean air, water, and population, that such a plan would include protections for our very vulnerable wildlife. There are too few voices for them, and apparently none were raised in preparation of this document. A beautiful but sterile landscape in the deserts, grasslands, mountains, waterways and backcountry would result from abandoning inclusion of wildlife protections when preparing for transportation in our state. Highways, roads, train tracks become death traps either directly from road kill or slowly by dividing breeding populations.

**Response:**

[This particular public review was for the PPP, not the CTP 2040; however, these comments were forwarded to the Office of State Planning who is responsible for producing the CTP. In addition, "Plant and Wildlife and Habitat Conservation" was added to the Appendix D: Recommended Strategies Matrix for Community and Environmental Groups under the Topics of High Interest column. Appendix D provides outreach strategies, special considerations, and topics of high Interest particular to specific stakeholder groups.](#)

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Monday, February 12, 2018 9:35 AM

Name: Susan Carter

City: Julian, CA

Thank you for this opportunity. I'm very concerned about freeways that interrupt major wildlife crossings. This is already a significant problem for mountain lions (a California Protected Species), with some existing freeways having isolated some mountain lion groups, causing genetic problems. Please add language to the new Plan that requires analysis of the need for wildlife crossings in every new transportation project and roadway upgrades/modifications. If the analysis indicates that the upgrade or new project would impact natural wildlife paths then the budget for the road project should incorporate the cost for a wildlife crossing (either over the freeway or under it, depending on the topography). If it doesn't, the project should not be built. In addition, please include language in the Plan that the wildlife crossing must include fencing that guides animals toward the crossing.

**Response:**

Added "Plant and Wildlife Habitat Conservation" to Appendix D: Recommended Strategies Matrix for Community and Environmental Groups under the Topics of High Interest column. Appendix D provides outreach strategies, special considerations, and topics of high Interest particular to specific stakeholder groups.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Monday, February 12, 2018 3:05 PM

Name: Derek Kanter

Organization: Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics

City: Sacramento, CA

Aeronautics would like to delete one of the bullet points in Appendix F in the Draft PPP. We're overhauling the CASP and the referenced document (System Needs Assessment) will be going away in a year or two. We're not sure we should reference this product in the new PPP if we know it's going away. What would you advise?

**Response:**

Appendix F is a letter written in 2016 to FHWA as required by 23 CFR Part 450.212 regarding State consultation with non-metropolitan local officials in the statewide transportation planning and programming process. Therefore, the change cannot be made; however, future letter's addressing this matter will excluded reference to the General Aviation System Needs Assessment.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Monday, March 05, 2018 7:53 AM

Name: Kenneth Jowers

City: Pt. Arena, CA

For those of us who live along the South Coast of Mendocino County and use Hwy 1 on a daily basis, we would like to see the road access issue during the flooding at the Garcia River addressed.

It is a physical and psychological barrier to those of use who us the road as our only access to work, appointments, emergency situations and school. Please address this issue.

**Response:**

This comment is related to a local issue and was forwarded to the Caltrans District 1 office.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Monday, March 05, 2018 7:54 AM

Name: Albert Cendejas

City: Dinuba, CA

Although I work for a non-profit providing services to seniors, I make this comment as a member of the community.

Seniors are a growing population. What astonishes me is there are limited means of transportation for them. All throughout our rural communities there are seniors that are in need of some form of transportation. This includes but not limited to the local supermarket, clinics, senior centers, shopping, and or other health care facilities for education or care. These necessary essentials can be a integral part in keeping our senior population more years at home and away from senior convalescent homes and or hospitals which is very costly.

I ask if it can be considered for further subsidized public transportation for general use and also for Dial-A-Ride or curb to curb transportation. Most of our rural population do not have a stop nearby therefore their only form of getting around would be a curb to curb program. There are ADA programs that offer these programs but most our seniors cannot get the paperwork in.

Also, our public transportation buses are only equipped to handle a few seniors who are on wheel chairs. If numerous seniors need a ride then they will either have to wait for another bus or until a spot becomes available.

Our non-profit agency provides thousand of dollars worth of vouchers and tokens and these request keep growing year after year. Here may be a reason why, consider this:



Senior Citizens avg income: \$900  
Rent: \$350-500  
Overall Utilities: \$100-200  
Basic Necessities: \$100-200  
Medication: \$50-150  
One way trip: \$4-5 on public transportation

Depending on the seniors disciplined financial budgeting they may be able to utilize public transportation while others may not.

**Response:**

Comment was forwarded to the Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transit. However, the PPP emphasizes the fair treatment and involvement of the elderly in the transportation decision-making

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Date: Monday, March 05, 2018 10:26 AM  
Name: Ron Kosinski  
Organization: Caltrans  
City: Los Angeles, CA

PPP is universally recognized by transportation professionals as standing for Public-Private-Partnership.

**Response:**

Although "initialisms" or "acronyms" can present problems when used interchangeably for different or multiple meanings in various disciplines, PPP is clearly identified as standing for Public Participation Plan throughout the document and in Appendix G: List of Acronyms.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Date: Thursday, March 08, 2018 9:32 AM  
Name: Elisa Arias  
Organization: SANDAG  
City: San Diego, CA

Thanks for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft PPP for the 2050 CTP. We offer the following comments for your consideration.

- Figure 1 on page 5 does a nice job of explaining the alignment of local, regional, and state transportation plans.

- The PPP indicates that outreach input overwhelmingly indicated that the public prefers communicating via Internet. Was this input received from a diverse audience including low-income individuals, persons with disabilities, and elderly, who may have limited Internet access?
- Social media is missing from the Public Outreach Toolbox.
- Text in the key box on page 18 is cut off.
- Content on page 18 could be supported by a graphic that shows how MPOs' FTIPs fit into the states FSTIP. It s a little confusing with all the acronyms, and here s a great place to use visualization to support the message
- Consider expanding the innovative outreach section.
- The PPP suggests using MPO communications departments to share information about CTP at the regional level. We look forward to hearing from Caltrans how to support this effort.
- There is reference to surveys being the public s least favorite way to get involved. Could you add a citation to back that up. We are curious about this as we consider surveys for the SANDAG Regional Plan development.
- Will the final PPP include more discussion on LEP/LAP considerations?
- The gray font is a bit hard to read on a white background. This document would be more ADA accessible if there were more contrast (darker gray or black text).
- Additional proofing will find missing Oxford commas (they re used inconsistently) and mis-spelling of a few words.
- MPOs are referred as Metropolitan Planning Agencies; it should be Organizations.

#### Response:

- (1) Comment noted.
- (2) This information was collected from stakeholder interviews and public workshops. However, page 13 indicates that most CTP 2040 focus group participants, who were selected from a diverse cross-section of the population, felt the best way to create awareness and engage the public was through traditional media.
- (3) Correction made.
- (4) Correction made.
- (5) Comment noted.
- (6) Comment noted.
- (7) Comment noted.
- (8) This information was collected from stakeholder interviews and public workshops.
- (9) Comment noted.
- (10) Comment noted.
- (11) Comment noted.
- (12) Correction made

Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:33 AM

Name: Kevin Burton

City: West Hollywood, CA

The draft PPP is thorough and worthy of adoption.

I think the Plan should make clear the process for those members of the public who have provided input to monitor follow-up by the relevant agencies.

Ways in which the public can participate in procedures for developing, accessing and allocating funds should be enumerated. Many of these procedures fall outside of the CTP itself (e.g., budget decisions in the legislature).

Concerning the draft PPP document itself:

- 1) although abbreviations are defined throughout, a glossary would be helpful;
- 2) in Appendix D, p. D-2 (PDF p. 51), third row, column 3, second bullet point ("Ask Caltrans staff "): "importation" should be "important".

#### Response

- (1) Comment noted.
- (2) Public comments and response will be posted on the PPP website at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/osp/ppp.html>.
- (3) Comments
- (4) Comment noted.
- (5) Appendix G: List of Acronyms.
- (6) Correction made.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Thursday, March 08, 2018 1:18 PM

Name: Kevin Lum

Organization: Caltrans

City: Fresno, CA

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Public Participation Plan (PPP). Below are Caltrans D6 Planning comments.

- 1) Page 4, Purpose and Background, Sixth Paragraph: The document should be written using the appropriate pronouns, i.e., Caltrans rather than we , and the Public rather than they for clarity and to avoid being interpreted as if from a consultant's perspective.

- 2) Page 8, under What the Public Wants to Know : The brown line after the third bullet point in Visualization Techniques should be removed.
- 3) Page 10, Fifth Paragraph, under Use Diverse Outreach Tools: Please remove the word potential and replace we with Caltrans.
- 4) Page 10, under Engage the Traditionally Underserved : The term under-represented is used. This section should provide information to address the legislatively defined terms, i.e., Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) , Environmental Justice (E.J.) , and Title VI (T6) . The term under-represented does not address these terms because DAC is a State term while E.J. and T6 are federal terms.
- 5) Page 12, under Get Connected : Environmental Justice and Title VI should be added to the list of Interested Parties Under Federal Regulations .
- 6) Page 13, under CTP 2040 Major Findings , Fourth Bullet Point: Please remove on behalf of a minority group for clarity as attendees are not necessarily associated with a particular group.
- 7) Page 28, under Tribal Government Consultation , Third Paragraph: This section should note that this is the Caltrans Native American Advisory Committee.
- 8) Page C-1, Appendix C: The CTP and FSTIP public participation website is mentioned as an outreach method. Will Caltrans be taking responsibility for developing the website? If so, an estimated go live date/year as well as a proposal for how the website will be marketed should be included in this section.
- 9) Page D-1, Appendix D: The second Category should read, Tribal Governments, Local, Regional, State and Federal Agencies and Organizations . This is recommended because tribal governments are not federal agencies, but sovereign nations.
- 10) The document needs to include additional language on the role of Caltrans System Planning products in relation to the California Transportation Plan (CTP) and Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) development and implementation.

Page 24, under Figure 2: Public Involvement Opportunities : Updates of Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs) and Corridor Planning Studies are listed as opportunities for public involvement beyond the update of the CTP. Page F-2 to F-5, Appendix F: The Non-Metropolitan Local Official Consultation Process includes separate sections on Multi-Modal System Planning, Programming, and State Planning. Although it is good that these processes and their products are mentioned and described, the PPP should provide further language linking these processes and their products, describing their relationship with the CTP, FSTIP, and each other. The Transportation Concept Reports, CSMPs, and corridor studies are more than simply auxiliary documents; they are critical planning and programming tools for District level Caltrans staff and partner agencies, and are one of the primary mechanisms by which geometric and volumetric information on Caltrans facilities is made available to the! public prior to project delivery. Caltrans System Planning products inform the CTP from an interregional perspective so the document should reflect this for the benefit and coordinated efforts of Caltrans, its partners, stakeholders, and the public.

**Response:**

- (1) Correction made.
- (2) Correction made.
- (3) Correction made.
- (4) Correction made.
- (5) Comment noted.
- (6) Correction made.
- (7) Correction made
- (8) Comment noted. CTP website ([www.californiatransporationplan.org](http://www.californiatransporationplan.org)) FSITP website <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/oftmp.htm>
- (9) Correction made
- (10) Comment noted.
- (11) Comment noted

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Friday, March 09, 2018 8:11 AM

Name: Richard Kenvin

City: San Diego

Me + point A + point B = ?

I'd like it to be my legs, a bike, a train whenever possible.

I never, ever want to drive or fly from San Diego to Los Angeles or San Francisco again.

Absurd!

Hope I live long enough to ride that high speed rail that we should have had 40 years ago.

It appears that CALTRANS is taking some positive steps to remedy decades of damage done by front-loading automobile infrastructure in a frantic scramble to keep things moving in the face rampant dumb growth development. Better late than never. I do understand that powerful forces have been working against you in regards to smart growth and smart transportation, I applaud your efforts at facing them down, and sincerely hope you purge any special interests who continue to oppose long over due projects such as high speed rail. May the fossil fuel agents be purged from CALTRANS and silenced in the face of vastly improved pedestrian, bike, and rail infrastructure. May California, land of the combustion engine, become the land of no combustion engines. A land with the most functional, user friendly, and inexpensive network of pedestrian, bicycle, and rail transportation in the world. Thank you for your efforts to make that happen.

**Response:**

Comments noted.



Date: Friday, March 09, 2018 11:31 AM

Name: Sam Dunlap

Organization: Gabrielino Tongva Nation

City: Los Angeles, CA

The Gabrielino Tongva Nation is Tribal entity whose traditional tribal territory includes the Counties of Los Angeles and Orange, with overlapping segments of western Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Our primary concern is the protection and preservation of our prehistoric cultural resources that may be impacted by future improvements and development of the California roadway system.

I request that the appropriate designated personnel contact me regarding any future highway development within the traditional tribal territory of the Gabrielino Tongva Nation that involves subsurface construction activity so that a proper consultation process may be initiated.

The process of consultation regarding future construction activity may result in the need to implement a Native American monitoring component that would aid in the proper identification and assessment of the cultural resources of our tribe.

In the event that a Native American monitor is required within our traditional tribal territory then I request that I be contacted directly in order to facilitate the process of providing a Native American monitor from the Gabrielino Tongva Nation with cultural affiliation to the project area.

Response:

This comment was forwarded to the Caltrans Native American Liaison Branch, and Caltrans District 7, 8 and 12 offices.



Date: Friday, March 09, 2018 11:52 AM

Name: John Olejnik

Organization: Caltrans

City: San Luis Obispo, CA

District 5 Planning provides the following comments to the draft PPP:

1) Page 7 – It's an excellent idea to produce a CTP newsletter to better inform the public. This newsletter could be distributed to the local transportation planning agencies and their respective technical advisory committees as well.

2) Page 13 - We agree with the CTP's findings that traditional media is the best way to keep the public informed.

3) Page 20 – This CTP is innovative in that it works to involve the public more with their local transportation planning agencies' planning and programming efforts. It highlights the need for more involvement.

4) Overall, it's an excellent draft public participation plan.

**Response:**

Comments noted.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

Friday, March 09, 2018 4:42 PM

Name: David Schonbrunn

Organization: TRANSDEF.org

City: San Rafael, CA

The PPP bears no resemblance to the real world of the public participation process. In recent history, senior Caltrans management ignored both the public input commending the draft CTP 2040 and the mandates of SB 391. (See TRANSDEF's letters on the CTC's CTP Guidelines process.)

This was totally non-transparent and violative of law. This abusive process did not "foster meaningful and ongoing public involvement in the CTP and FSTIP planning and programming process to ensure future transportation decisions and investments reflect community interests and values." (PPP p. P-1.)

A PPP cannot possibly constitute a meaningful public involvement process unless senior management commits to providing a detailed explanation of its reasons for approving modifications to a draft that has received public comment.

**Response:**

Comments Noted.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇